

**BAKER BOTTs L.L.P.**  
Bryant C. Boren, Jr. (SBN 260602)  
[bryant.c.boren@bakerbotts.com](mailto:bryant.c.boren@bakerbotts.com)  
Eliot D. Williams (SBN 290780)  
[eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com](mailto:eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com)  
Kevin E. Cadwell (SBN 255794)  
[kevin.cadwell@bakerbotts.com](mailto:kevin.cadwell@bakerbotts.com)  
Jon V. Swenson (SBN 233054)  
[jon.swenson@bakerbotts.com](mailto:jon.swenson@bakerbotts.com)  
Elizabeth K. Boggs (SBN 280555)  
[elizabeth.boggs@bakerbotts.com](mailto:elizabeth.boggs@bakerbotts.com)  
1001 Page Mill Road, Building One  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
Telephone: 650.739.7500  
Facsimile: 650.739.7699

Russell J. Crain (*pro hac vice*)  
russ.crain@bakerbotts.com  
Brian D. Johnston (*pro hac vice*)  
brian.johnston@bakerbotts.com  
2001 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75201  
Telephone: 214.953.6500  
Facsimile: 214.953.6503

*Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaimants  
AT&T MOBILITY LLC and AT&T MOBILITY II LLC*

[Additional counsel listed on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ENOVSYS LLC,

Plaintiff,

VS.

AT&T MOBILITY LLC and AT&T  
MOBILITY II LLC.

## Defendants.

AT&T MOBILITY LLC and AT&T  
MOBILITY II LLC,

#### **Counterclaimants,**

VS.

ENOVSYS LLC,

## Counterdefendant.

Case No.: 2:11-CV-05210-FMO (AGRx)

**DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF  
MOTION AND MOTION IN LIMINE  
NO. 5 TO EXCLUDE REFERENCES  
TO OTHER LITIGATIONS  
INVOLVING AT&T**

Hearing Date: March 21, 2014

Hearing Time: 10:00 AM

Honorable Judge Fernando M. Olguin

**Trial Date: April 8, 2014**

1           **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT** Defendants AT&T Mobility LLC and  
2 AT&T Mobility II LLC (“AT&T”) move in limine to prevent Enovsys from  
3 arguing or introducing evidence relating to other litigations involving AT&T.

4           Subject to the Court’s availability, the motions will be heard on March 21,  
5 2014, at 10:00 am, before the Honorable Judge Fernando M. Olguin. Defendants  
6 base their motion on the memorandum of points and authorities set forth below,  
7 any subsequently filed supplemental briefing and accompanying papers, the  
8 pleadings and papers filed in this action, and any other arguments, evidence, and  
9 matters submitted to the Court, at the hearing or otherwise.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

AT&T Mobility and AT&T Mobility II (“AT&T”) request that the Court exclude evidence or argument referring to any reference to or mention of any other litigation involving AT&T as improper character evidence under Federal Rule of Evidence 404 and unduly prejudicial and confusing under Rule 403.

**II. ARGUMENT**

Federal Rule of Evidence 404 expressly prohibits parties from drawing conclusions as to what occurred in a particular instance from character evidence or past acts. *See Fed R. Evid. 404(a)(1)* (character evidence is “not admissible to prove that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character or trait”); *Fed. R. Evid. 404(b)(1)* (“Evidence of a crime, wrong, or other act is not admissible to prove a person’s character in order to show that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character or trait.”). Therefore, outside of the litigation settlement agreements that AT&T has produced in this case, Enovsys should not be allowed to make any reference to previous litigations or accusations of infringement related to AT&T before the jury.<sup>1</sup>

Rule 403 also mandates the exclusion of references to other litigations involving AT&T on the ground of undue prejudice. *See Fed. R. Evid. 403*. Allowing references to separate proceedings involving AT&T will result in unfair prejudice to AT&T by raising an inference that AT&T must be guilty in this action because it has been sued previously for patent infringement. That evidence is improper for the jury to consider under Rule 401 and unduly prejudicial under Rule 403 because it could impact the outcome of the current lawsuit. Accordingly, AT&T respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion to exclude any

<sup>1</sup> AT&T produced settlement agreements with Tendler Cellular and EMSAT in this case. AT&T does not seek to exclude otherwise admissible evidence or testimony regarding these agreements through this motion in limine.

1 reference to or mention of separate proceedings involving AT&T outside of  
2 reference to the settlement agreements AT&T produced in this litigation.

3 **III. CONCLUSION**

4 AT&T Mobility respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion to  
5 exclude at trial any reference to or mention of any other litigation involving  
6 AT&T.

7 Dated: February 28, 2014

Respectfully submitted,  
8 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

9 /s/ Eliot D. Williams  
10 Eliot D. Williams

11 Attorney for Defendants and  
12 Counterclaimants  
13 AT&T MOBILITY LLC and AT&T  
14 MOBILITY II LLC